

## **REMARKS**

Applicants herein respond to all outstanding objections/rejections.

Applicants have amended the claims for purposes of expediting prosecution and for placing the application in condition of allowance. Applicants preserve the right to file continuing applications on all Canceled claims and/or deleted subject matter. No new matter has been added by this amendment.

### **Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)**

The Office has rejected claims 1, 8, 9, and 43 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b), alleging that these claims are unpatentable over Cho et al., U.S. 5,780,472. Applicants respectfully traverse.

The Examiner stated that claim 11 would be allowable if written in independent form, including any limitation of the base claim and any intervening claim. For the sole purpose of expediting prosecution, Applicants have Canceled claims 5, 8, 9 and 11 without prejudice and have incorporated the elements of claim 5, 9 and 11 into claim 1. Applicants note that claim 9 is a narrower definition of  $R^2$  than in claim 8, from which claim 9 depends from.

Since all limitations of pending claims 5, 9 and 11 have been incorporated into claim 1, this rejection has been rendered moot in view of this amendment. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection.

### **Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)**

The Office has rejected claims 1, 8, 9, and 43 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), alleging that these claims are unpatentable over Cho et al., U.S. 5,780,472. Applicants respectfully traverse.

The Examiner stated that claim 11 would be allowable if written in independent form, including any limitation of the base claim and any intervening claim. For the sole purpose of expediting prosecution, Applicants have Canceled claims 5, 8, 9 and 11 without prejudice and have incorporated the elements of claim 5, 9 and 11 into claim 1. Applicants note that claim 9 is a narrower definition of  $R^2$  than in claim 8, from which claim 9 depends from.

Because all limitations of pending claims 5, 9 and 11 have been incorporated into claim 1, this rejection has been rendered moot in view of this amendment. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection.

If it is believed that a teleconference will advance prosecution, the examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned as indicated below.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: November 8, 2010

/Michael S. Greenfield/  
Michael S. Greenfield  
Registration No. 37,142

Telephone: 312-913-0001  
Facsimile: 312-913-0002

**McDonnell Boehnen Hulbert & Berghoff LLP**  
300 South Wacker Drive  
Chicago, IL 60606